A. Objectives:

Our general objective is to scrutinize public policy approaches as they are revealed by regional development, primarily for urban centered territories. I intend to look at both the opportunities for, and the limitations of, comprehensive designs for governing these spaces. There will be an attempt to study the effectiveness of various elite actors and their oft-times conflicting agendas for development strategies.

In short, this seminar will focus on the comparative political economy of urban regions, with a particular eye to their regime politics and degrees of institutional congruence with these. Although the course is intended to be comparative in theory, and by locale, my own extensive experience has been principally with growth and development in Canadian city-regions.

Policy about course outlines, grading and related matters can be found in Section 23.4 (2) of the University Calendar.

B. Some Basic Questions:

1. In what ways do regional political institutions, and the political activities surrounding them, reflect their underlying political communities? E.E. Schattschneider speaks of political institutions as representing ‘a mobilization of bias,’ reflecting both the forgoing and the dominant power structure of the place and period. Should we concur?

2. How does the existence of a maze of intergovernmental structures, horizontal as well as central-local, affect the determination among alternative public policy choices? Whose issues, when, become important? Can we well evaluate the salience of the formal structures of the substate region in an IT age? To whom?

3. What ways may institutionalized political behaviours, even if only quasi-organized, bring order to the civic agendas of the nominally independent municipal politicians? How is the open face of power mobilized, expressed? Which established theories of collective behaviour are most helpful to understanding?

4. In what effective fashions may bureaucratic filtering and structuring among legitimate alternatives play an active role in the assignment of values and priorities (and whose?) both before and after ‘decisions’ are taken?
C. Course Texts(s):


D. Some Reference Texts:


E. Evaluations:

Mid-term marks are an indicator of concrete success on those tasks. The final grades will be scaled in alignment with expectations in the Faculty of Arts to reflect students’ relative performance in the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of Reading</td>
<td>20 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Essay</td>
<td>40 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critique of Essay</td>
<td>10 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Review</td>
<td>10 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Participation</td>
<td>20 per cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES ON ASSIGNMENTS:

1. Some oral comments on assigned readings, around ten minutes in presentation, will be heard at sessions on February 1, 9th and 29th. Students will be expected to summarize, critically, what they have read, emphasizing thesis, research methods employed, the validity of the major findings, and the utility of the approach for exploring our course objectives. It is to be noted that a ‘critical’ assessment is an evaluation, an appraisal of the
strengths as well as any deficiencies in the material you have read. Students are expected to take the initiative in selecting an appropriate article or chapter to review.

2. The major essay, of approximately 3,500 words, or up to 15 double-spaced typewritten pages, will be assigned through negotiation with the instructor and is intended to explore a subject related to the course objectives.

* The paper is to be distributed to all seminar participants the Friday prior to the Monday class discussion.

* The instructor requires a complete paper in conventional form (i.e. a printout) at an agreed Friday time for assessment.

* Students are advised to arrange to meet with the instructor early in the term concerning this major assignment.

My E-mail address is: jim.lightbody@ualberta.ca

3. Each student will be expected to critique, formally, one major student essay. The object of this exercise is to initiate seminar discussion of the major paper. This critique will be presented verbally.

4. The book review of some 750 to 1,000 words may be submitted to the instructor at any time prior to 8th April, 2016. Some suggested titles are appended to this course outline, but the list is only suggestive, indicative of the range of materials you may find appropriate. It is not exhaustive. I look forward to seeing your choices.

5. Both written presentations are expected to conform consistently to a recognized style manual for the social sciences.

6. No ‘Incomplete’ grades will be assigned in Political Science 540 or 435. All work will be evaluated as of 8th April, 2016.

**Courtesy Note:**

Students are expected to treat their classmates with appropriate respect. As appropriate, all handheld electronic devices are normally to be both turned off and stowed away while you are in the classroom. Distracting offenders will be required to exit the seminar.

**Late penalties:**

It is your responsibility to inform the instructor should it become clear that you will miss an assignment. If you do not explain your absence in advance, and if your subsequent reasons for being absent prove not to be satisfactory and why you did not advise the instructor, the penalty is a grade of zero for the work missed.
Plagiarism and academic dishonesty:

The University of Alberta is committed to the highest standards of academic integrity and honesty. Students are expected to be familiar with these standards regarding academic honesty and to uphold the policies of the University in this respect. Students are particularly urged to familiarize themselves with the provisions of the Code of Student Behaviour (online at www.ualberta.ca/secretariat/appeals.htm) and avoid any behaviour which could potentially result in suspicions of cheating, plagiarism, misrepresentation of facts and/or participation in an offence. Academic dishonesty is a serious offence and can result in suspension or expulsion from the University. An important excerpt from the Code of Student Behaviour is appended at the end of this syllabus.

F. Course Outline:

January 4  Course Outline: Urban regions for the 2010s

January 11 Lecture: “States, Substates and Intergovernmental Networks in Regional Developments: a general chat about governing city-regions.

Abstract: The analysis of the municipal governing in Canadian Census Metropolitan Areas once led to a variety of alternative schemes for reconstituted bi-level institutions. This lecture first considers the historical and ideological context for the emergence of two-tier urban governments after World War II. It is then argued that area-wide governments had outgrown their original purposes to become redundant by the 1990s. The case is advanced that provincial authorities should now assume direct control for such regional metropolitan policies as defy the best cooperative efforts of existing, front-line, general purpose local governments.


- Lightbody, James, City Politics, Canada, Chapter 12, “Organizing city governments in the metropolis,” pp. 429-70.

January 18  Lecture: “Public Policy Tactics of Urban Regional Development”

**Abstract:** Led by business, urban regimes constitute the **sous-politics** of Canadian city-regions. When it comes to city-region municipal integration however, small cartels of local public officials facing absolute loss of political standing, and their clientele allies, constitute formidable barriers normally sufficient to frustrate reorganization initiatives. This is especially probable when urban regimes in city-regions consider the low politics of municipalities to be of insufficient consequence to intervene for wider purposes. A litany of small grievances may nonetheless build to the point where the constitutional supremacy and centralized executive of Canada’s provincial parliamentary system is invoked. Cabinets have then intervened in periodic, sudden and radically dramatic restructurings. In such a context, regime influences at the apex of political authority overwhelms behaviours and explanations rooted in, among other items, the citizen engagement rhetoric of the new localism. This discussion considers such instances as the Toronto amalgamation of 1997-1998 and Montreal, 2000-2001.


- Roberts, Brian and Stimson, Robert J., “Multi-sectoral qualitative analysis: a tool for assessing the competitiveness of regions and formulating strategies for economic

Abstract: The purpose here is to examine the specific policies and programs of municipalities in two Canadian city-regions, as measured by a preliminary (and on-going) analysis of expenditures, with an eye to calculating if substantive spending differences exist between suburbs and central cities. If there are, then the question becomes whether this constitutes a free ride advantage for suburbs in an otherwise integrated social and economic system.

In The Logic of Collective Action, Mancur Olson offers precise insight into the basis of the “free rider” idea when, after calculating the sources for rational choices made in most forms of human association, he observes that “the distribution of the burden of providing the public good in a small group will not be in proportion to the benefits conferred by the collective good” (1971: 29). Hypotheses are developed from this to evaluate suburban behaviour in city-regional policy delivery, the most important of which is: “Where small groups with common interests are concerned, then, there is a systematic tendency for ‘exploitation’ of the great by the small!”

Demographic evidence reveals that Canadian suburban councils have acted in a genteel fashion to exclude newcomers (and other unacceptable categories of residents) and thus absent themselves from any need to provide services for these social categories. They become free riders on the city-regional policy omnibus and the budget of the region’s central city. However, since the numbers analyzed reveal few correlations and aggregate suburban spending in eight broad budget categories does not vary significantly from core cities, then observed substantive differences in policy are only obscured, not absent.

- Lightbody, James, City Politics, Canada, Chapter 11, “Theoretical questions about metropolitan institutions,” pp. 405-28.


February 1    Discussion of readings A: Definition of Booster Priorities
February 9    Discussion of readings B: Definition of Development Strategies
February 15   Second term Reading Week
February 22   Special guest, TBA
February 29   Discussion of readings C: Intergovernmental Networks
March 7       Major Student Essays
March 14      Major Student Essays
March 21      Major Student Essays
March 28      Easter Monday, University expires
April 4       Summary & Conclusion: Strategic Planning at City Hall

G. Readings for Topic Areas:

Readings for Topic A: Definition of Booster Priorities


Readings for Topic B: Definition of Development Strategies


Readings for Topic C: Intergovernmental Networks


H. Public Policy Selected Bibliography:


I. Some Possible Titles for Book Reviews:


Amendments to the Code of Student Behaviour occur throughout the year. For the most recent version of the Code, visit http://www.governance.ualberta.ca/

NOTICE TO INSTRUCTORS REGARDING PLAGIARISM, CHEATING, MISREPRESENTATION OF FACTS AND PARTICIPATION IN AN OFFENCE

The U of A considers plagiarism, cheating, misrepresentation of facts and participation in an offence to be serious academic offences. Plagiarism, cheating, misrepresentation of facts and participation in an offence can be avoided if students are told what these offences are and if possible sanctions are made clear at the outset. Instructors should understand that the principles embodied in the Code are essential to our academic purpose. For this reason, instructors will be fully supported by Departments, Faculties and the University in their endeavours to rightfully discover and pursue cases of academic dishonesty in accordance with the Code.

At the beginning of each term, we ask you to review with your students the definitions of plagiarism and cheating. We are now also asking you to review with your students the definition of Misrepresentation of Facts and Participation in an Offence. Your co-operation and assistance in this matter are much appreciated.

30.3.2(1) Plagiarism

No Student shall submit the words, ideas, images or data of another person as the Student’s own in any academic writing, essay, thesis, project, assignment, presentation or poster in a course or program of study.

30.3.2(2) Cheating

30.3.2(2)a No Student shall in the course of an examination or other similar activity, obtain or attempt to obtain information from another Student or other unauthorized source, give or attempt to give information to another Student, or use, attempt to use or possess for the purposes of use any unauthorized material.

30.3.2(2)b No Student shall represent or attempt to represent him or herself as another or have or attempt to have himself or herself represented by another in the taking of an examination, preparation of a paper or other similar activity. See also misrepresentation in 30.3.6(4).

30.3.2(2)c No Student shall represent another’s substantial editorial or compositional assistance on an assignment as the Student’s own work.

30.3.2(2)d No Student shall submit in any course or program of study, without the written approval of the course Instructor, all or a substantial portion of any academic writing, essay, thesis, research report, project, assignment, presentation or poster for which credit has previously been obtained by the Student or which has been or is being submitted by the Student in another course or program of study in the University or elsewhere.

30.3.2(2)e No Student shall submit in any course or program of study any academic writing, essay, thesis, report, project, assignment, presentation or poster containing a statement of fact known by the Student to be false or a reference to a source the Student knows to contain fabricated claims (unless acknowledged by the Student), or a fabricated reference to a source.

30.3.6(4) Misrepresentation of Facts

No Student shall misrepresent pertinent facts to any member of the University community for the purpose of obtaining academic or other advantage. This includes such acts as the failure to provide pertinent information on an application for admission or the altering of an educational document/transcript.

30.3.6(5) Participation in an Offence

No Student shall counsel or encourage or knowingly aid or assist, directly or indirectly, another person in the commission of any offence under this Code.

More information can be found at: http://www.osja.ualberta.ca/en.aspx
**EXCERPTS FROM THE CODE OF STUDENT BEHAVIOUR**

**FOR REVIEW WITH EACH CLASS AT THE BEGINNING OF EVERY TERM**

### Procedures for Instructors Regarding

**Plagiarism, Cheating,**

**Misrepresentation of Facts and Participation in an Offence**

The following procedures are drawn from the *Code of Student Behaviour* as approved by GFC and the Board of Governors. The guidelines summarize what instructors must do when they have reason to believe that a student has plagiarized, cheated, misrepresented facts or participated in an offence. If you have questions about these guidelines, or about the policies, please talk with the senior administrator in your Faculty responsible for dealing with student discipline—usually an Associate Dean, or the Appeals and Compliance Officer (Appeals Coordinator, University Governance—2-2655).

**30.5.4 Procedures for Instructors in Cases Respecting Inappropriate Academic Behaviour**

**30.5.4(1)** When an Instructor believes that a Student may have committed an Inappropriate Academic Behaviour Offence [30.3.2] or that there has been Misrepresentation of Facts [30.3.6(4)] or Participation in an Offence [30.3.6(5)] in cases respecting Inappropriate Academic Behaviour in the course that he or she instructs, the Instructor will meet with the Student. Before such a meeting, the Instructor shall inform the Student of the purpose of the meeting. In the event that the Student refuses or fails to meet with the Instructor within a reasonable period of time specified by the Instructor, the Instructor shall, taking into account the available information, decide whether a report to the Dean is warranted.

**30.5.4(2)** If the Instructor believes there has been a violation of the Code, the Instructor shall, as soon as possible after the event occurred, report that violation to the Dean and provide a written statement of the details of the case. The Instructor may also include a recommendation for sanction.

### Possible Sanctions

One or more of the following sanctions given in 30.4.3 (2) and (3) of the Code are commonly used for plagiarism, cheating, participation in an offence, and misrepresentation of facts:

- 30.4.3(2) a.i a mark reduction or a mark of 0 on any term work or examination for reason of Inappropriate Academic Behaviour
- 30.4.3(2) a.ii Reduction of a grade in a course
- 30.4.3(2) a.iii a grade of F for a course
- 30.4.3(2) a.iv a remark on a transcript of 8 (or 9 for failing graduate student grades), indicating Inappropriate Academic Behaviour, in addition to 30.4.3(2)a.i, 30.4.3(2)a.ii or 30.4.3(2)a.iii
- 30.4.3(3) b Expulsion
- 30.4.3(3) c Suspension

The following sanctions may be used in rare cases:

- 30.4.3(3) e Suspension of a Degree already awarded
- 30.4.3(3) f Rescission of a Degree already awarded

**30.6.1 Initiation of an Appeal**

**30.6.1(1)** When a Student has been found to have committed an offence under the Code of Student Behaviour or an Applicant is found to have committed an offence under the Code of Applicant Behaviour, whether or not that Student or Applicant has been given a sanction, the Student or Applicant may appeal that decision, except in the case of a decision of the Discipline Officer under 30.5.6(2)e.ii, which remains final and is not subject to appeal. In cases where a severe sanction has been recommended to the Discipline Officer, once the student receives the final decision of the Discipline Officer, the student can appeal the decisions of both Dean and the Discipline Officer at the same time. The written appeal must be presented to the Appeals Coordinator in University Governance within 15 Working Days of the deemed receipt of the decision by the Student or Applicant. The finding that an offence has been committed, the sanction imposed or both may form the basis of appeal. The written appeal must also state the full grounds of appeal and be signed by the Appellant. The appeal shall be heard by the UAB.

**PROFESSOR STEVEN PENNEY**

**CHAIR, CAMPUS LAW REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**DR STEVEN DEW**

**PROVOST AND VICE-PRESIDENT (ACADEMIC)**

* The Campus Law Review Committee is a standing committee of General Faculties Council (GFC) responsible for the review of the *Code of Student Behaviour* and of student disciplinary procedures.
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